

The Republican.

No. 9, Vol. 13.] LONDON, Friday, March 3, 1826. [PRICE 6d.

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE OF MR. BEARD.

To Mr. Richard Carlile.

SIR,

AFTER having waited two months, and received various answers to my strictures on your paper calling in question the real existence of Jesus Christ; I may, I think, justly claim the privilege of putting in a rejoinder. This then, with your leave, I now proceed to do. To W. W. R. I have little to say, as he has granted me nearly all I wish to prove. A few remarks on some of his observations will appear in the course of my answer to Mr. Taylor and yourself. As the matter from Mr. Taylor's oration was first adduced by you, that claims the first notice. This letter, then, is addressed to him in refutation of his "Unitarianism Refuted." The next Number of "The Republican," with your permission, will contain a balance of accounts betwixt you and me; and I rather fear me you will be found to have shouted *Io triumphe* a little prematurely.

TO THE REV. ROBERT TAYLOR, A. B. & M. R. C. S.

Secretary and Chaplain of the Christian Evidence Society.

SIR,

BEFORE I proceed to controvert the chief positions which you have taken in your oration entitled "Unitarianism refuted," I deem it desirable to afford my readers the means of ascertaining the manner in which you conduct this controversy respecting the truth of Christianity. In your "manifesto" you inform the public that the evidences of the Christian religion are "calmly and impartially" examined at the meetings of the Society of which you are Secretary; and this "oration" it would not perhaps be erroneous to suppose may be regarded as a specimen of the temper in which your investigations proceed. A few extracts, then, from the "oration" will enable the public to appreciate the justness of the claim which you prefer to calmness and impartiality in the conduct of your discussions. "The sincere milk of God's word can only be sucked through the toothless gums of imbecility."

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 135, Fleet Street, London.

"Christ and his apostles are set up like Gog and Magog in Guildhall, to frighten fools and idiots; no sensible persons knowing whence they came, caring what they mean, or paying the least respect to the grim majesty of their painted Godhead."—"So would the vile hypocrisy of this canting age drive common sense and common honesty out of life to set up in their place a ragamuffin Son of God, a scarecrow Jesus."—"To make the accomplished saint what every saint that ever breathed hath been, or is, in understanding a fool, or in heart a villain."—"You will find no creature bearing human face and front so savage, so deceitful, so wicked as a Christian."—"We accuse them (Christians) of villainy and crime. They are bad and wicked men, and it is their religion that makes them such."—"The caballing villainy of our Bible Society gangs, Missionary banditti"—but enough, I am weary of transcribing such specimens of calmness and impartiality, and I have yet reached only the twelfth page of the oration. Mr. Belsham had said that the force of the evidence adduced by him must to a serious, candid, and unprejudiced enquirer be little less than irresistible. At this Mr. Taylor exclaims, "Now there is a direct moral injustice in any author thus assuming, that unless his readers come to the conclusions which he would prescribe to them, they cannot be serious, candid, and unprejudiced." Assume the propriety of Mr. Taylor's exclamation, and then say, my readers, how great must be the moral injustice of characterizing those who will not acquiesce in his decisions as "fools in understanding, or in heart villains." A man may be a learned and a good man (says Mr. Belsham, in the true spirit of candour) without being a Christian."—"Alas!" exclaims our Secretary, "the compliment cannot be returned, no Christian must ever think of being a philosopher." Sir Isaac Newton, Mr. Locke, and Dr. Priestley, avaunt, Christians that you are. Philosophy has awakened "a sleeping devil, whose fearful presence" causes "religion" to "shiver through every vein" of you. And notwithstanding Mr. Belsham is accused of falsifying historical testimonies, absolutely falsifying his own statements, with exciting the single feeling of a respectful pity for his weakness and debility of understanding, yet a few words farther on is he called a really clever and amiable man. How all these contradictory qualities can at once reside in the mind and heart of one man, might puzzle a better metaphysician than the "Reverend" "Secretary" and "Chaplain." Accordingly, the authority of Tillotson is appealed to in a note to justify these contradictions. Whether or not the sentence now about to be quoted really justifies them is not so much my object to enquire, as to expose one of the best specimens of garbling that ever I met with. This then is the note:—"It will be hard to determine (says Archbishop Tillotson) how many degrees of innocence and good nature, or of coldness and indifference in religion, are necessary to overbalance

the fury of blind zeal ; since several zealots had been excellent men if their religion had not hindered them, if the doctrines and principles of their church had not spoiled their natural disposition."—“ A just compliment (exclaims the “ Chaplain”) to the moral influence of divine *faith*. The perfect believer becomes a perfect fiend.” Now notice, readers, the inference of Mr. Taylor. Faith, Christian faith, converts, according to the “ compliment” of Tillotson, the perfect believer into the perfect fiend. It is the believer, the Christian, inasmuch as he is a believer and Christian, that becomes a perfect fiend. Let us then enquire what Archbishop Tillotson really says. He is preaching a sermon on the 5th of November ; he animadverts on the influence of *Catholicism* then lately evinced in the dreadful Irish massacres, and these are his words :—“ I do willingly acknowledge the great piety and charity of several persons who have lived and died in *that communion* (the Catholic) as Erasmus, Father Paul, Theanus, and many others, who had in truth more goodness in them than the principles of *their* religion do either incline men to or allow of, and yet he that considers how universally almost the *Papists* in Ireland were engaged in that massacre, which is still fresh in our memories, will find it very hard to determine how many degrees of innocence and good nature, or of coldness and indifference, are necessary to overbalance the fury of a blind zeal, and a *misguided conscience*. I doubt not but *Papists* are made like other men ; nature hath not generally given them such savage and cruel dispositions, but their religion hath made them so. *Whereas true Christianity is not only the best, but the best-natured institution in the world ; and as far as any church is departed from good nature, and become cruel and barbarous, so far is it degenerated from Christianity*. I am loth to say it, yet I am confident it is true, that many *Papists* would have been excellent persons if *their* religion had not hindered them ; if the doctrines and principles of their church had not perverted and spoiled their natural dispositions.” Was there ever a greater perversion ? Why take up a sentence in the middle, omitting the part essential to explain what follows ? Why change the construction of that latter part substituting “ it will be hard” for “ whoever, &c. &c. will find it hard ?” Why omit a sentence which speaks most honourably of Christianity and of its *moral* influences ? Why ascribe a word “ since” to the Archbishop which he uses not ? Why connect altogether in one sentence given as the identical words of Tillotson, when he spreads his matter through several ? Why supersede the word “ *Papist*” by one of his own coining, “ *zealots*,” altering the whole meaning of the passage ? I speak, my readers, as unto wise men, judge ye.

It will be necessary therefore my readers in our further consider-

• Vide Mr. Taylor’s “ oration,” page 4.

ration of Mr. Taylor's statements to use caution and weariness lest his calmness and impartiality should lead us astray. Mr. Taylor is not content with endeavouring to diminish the reputed number of early Christians, he wishes to deprive us also of the strong *argument* which is deduced from that fact in favour of the truth of Christianity. Mr. Belsham had stated on the authority of Heathen authors that a short time after the resurrection of Christ, multitudes professed belief in the divinity of his mission, and evidenced the sincerity of their profession by the endurance of persecution and the surrender of their lives. This part could not be accounted for but on the supposition of the truth of the Christian religion. It is necessary therefore to assume the truth of Christianity in order to account for certain well ascertained phenomena. This Mr. Taylor chose to designate 'an outrage on philosophy.' "What! (he indignantly exclaims) can philosophy then like a crab go backward, thus become preposterous, leap over all premises, assume the very thing to be proved and speak like John-a-dreams, repugnant of his purpose." Mr. Taylor claims the character of a man of learning and as such must have felt the absurdity of his own remarks. If he knows aught of the nature of reasoning employed in enquiries respecting the laws of nature, he could have written this passage only *ad captandum vulgus*, to impose upon the uninformed. To charge an opponent with *assuming* what he ought to prove, Mr. Taylor knew was the readiest way to secure the verdict of the jury before whom he pleaded his cause. But the subterfuge can impose upon none who are acquainted with the method of philosophizing followed by Sir I. Newton. He investigated the works of nature with a view to ascertain the laws by which their operations were guided. In his investigations he accumulated facts. But how was he to explain those facts, how discover the law to which they were referable? That hypothesis, which explained all the phenomena that he or others had observed, suggested the law of which he was in search. A stone when thrown into the air returns to the earth; the inhabitants of the opposite side of the globe walk with their feet towards our feet, loose rocks and stones on the surface of our planet fall not away from their places; suppose then that every particle of matter in this globe attracts every other particle, This being assumed, the afore-named phenomena are accounted for, the hypothesis, therefore, is true, the assumption is converted into proof. To illustrate still further the method of philosophizing pursued by our great philosopher. As I am walking over an extended plain, I descry something in the distance whose real nature is not apparent from the indistinctness of its outline. I walk forward, and then suppose the objects to be branches of trees, a few more steps undeceive me, and I perceive they are human beings. It is clear, however, that I shall not join them, for they are advancing in the same direction with myself. I proceed

onwards and begin to doubt of the correctness of this hypothesis also. The distance between us appears to decrease. They approach still nearer, I perceive my error, and suppose now that they are advancing towards me. A few minutes relieve me from doubt and confirm my last supposition. I assume that we were proceeding in opposite directions—because we have met. No other hypothesis can explain the given phenomena, that assumption therefore is true. Such, says Mr. Belsham, is the nature of the philosophical argument that I adduce in favour of Christianity. It must be true or false, I ascertain the rapidity of its early progress. If it had been false it never could have spread so extensively in so short a period, when the best means were possessed for the exposure of its unfounded pretensions. The assumption then of its being false cannot explain the acknowledged phenomena. There only remains one other supposition, that is, that Christianity is true. If true, it would quickly spread itself: its evidence is overpowering, the favourable opportunities for its investigation enjoyed by the early Christians, were equally favourable to conviction. The hypothesis therefore which supposes its truth is the correct one. That hypothesis I assume; but it explains all facts; the assumption therefore rests on the best possible evidence. Mr. Taylor then proceeds in a more legitimate method of reasoning to assert that the recorded facts may be explained on the supposition of Christianity being false. To establish his point, he refers to transubstantiation, and, asks if thousands of persons would not swear, and hold themselves ready to die for what they swear, that they had eaten and drank the corporeal flesh and blood of the Deity. Granting the correctness of Mr. Taylor's statement, I cannot imagine that when proved he will contend that the cases are parallel. The persons to whom Mr. Taylor refers have been *educated* in the belief of the doctrine of transubstantiation, have cherished it as a tenet sanctioned by antiquity, revered by their fathers, conducive to their own best interests, associated with their dearest feelings in the past and their brightest anticipation in the future.—Those who renounced Paganism had first to render powerless all these interesting associations, then to receive some 'new thing,' not only subversive of former prejudices, but hostile to former practices also, with which their hearts had never beat in unison, and their understandings connected nothing in this life, but obloquy, desertion, and death. No, never has it been known that men renounced the opinions of their youth, of their fathers and their mothers, received in their stead some unheard of novelty, left home and kindred, exchanged their blessings for curses and contempt, wandered about in want and woe, persecuted and forlorn:—yes, gave their lives a pledge of their conviction and veracity;—and all for what?—to propagate a base fabrication of their own, or of their fellows: without ob-

ject, except to deceive; without advantage, except it were found in the pangs of torture and death.

But, rejoins Mr. Taylor, neither the primitive Christians nor "the whole human race," can evidence the existence of a miracle. Why? Because, "man is a fallible creature and may be deceived, he is a perverse creature and may be deceitful." And as Mr. Taylor is a man, he may possess these qualities, and negative his assertions by his own argument: the more so when he sets himself in opposition to "the whole human race." Let them testify to a miracle, says Mr. Taylor, they are men, they are fallible, they are perverse, and I a man neither fallible nor perverse. I tell them "they lie, though they were millions." A miracle, he adds, is an impossibility to God himself, as an argument of weakness, not of power. In other words it is an argument of weakness not of power, that a father corrects his child, that a machinist arrests the working of an engine, that a lawgiver deviates from his usual course of procedure. I had thought that ancient fate which was fabled to bind the gods in its iron chains, indicated weakness rather than power. But liberty it seems, full and perfect liberty, to do whatever is most fitting upon the whole and for each particular juncture, liberty is an argument of *weakness*. Mr. Carlile certainly differs from his friend Mr. Taylor in this respect: otherwise while in prison he was very anxious to *diminish* his power, by procuring his liberation.

Leaving to Mr. Taylor the office which he has assumed, of precisely defining what the divine being cannot perform, I feel it to be much the safer course to argue from analogy what is within the range of his power.

Mr. Taylor professes himself to be a Theist, and as such, believes, we may presume, in the existence of a supreme and infinitely perfect mind, the Creator of the present system of the universe. How then can he deny that the being who made all things is competent to change those things which he made? Surely he who established the laws of nature can suspend the laws which he established:—he that at first made man and breathed into him the breath of life, has power to re-animate the insensible corse. Admit the creation of man and you have admitted the exertion of miraculous agency. How then in consistency can we deny the possibility of its exertion in other instances? If we might be allowed to measure a miracle by the magnitude of the result, we should be authorized to affirm that the production of this system with all its glorious furniture of worlds innumerable, magnificence unequalled, abounding in animated beings who rejoice in their existence, implies an infinitely greater miracle than is presented to us in the stilling of the fury of the mightiest ocean, much less of a small lake in Galilee. Is it replied that the cases are not strictly analogous, that now there exists an established constitution of na-

ture which of course had no being prior to the production of the world? It is true, and still the cases are analogous. Anterior to the use of this system God existed. Then were there worlds and modes of existence, and laws relating them. Yet the supreme interposed, gave a new feature to created existence, and caused the morning stars to sing together for joy at the happiness of the new born world. If he once varied the face of the universe, why not a second time? If he once modified the laws which regulate his actions—whether by extending their application or diversifying their character, he affords us a demonstration that he is at least *capable* of departing from the ordinary mode of his government. It was for the benefit of those whom he should create, that he added new worlds to the sphere of his agency. Benevolence alone prompted him to exert his creative power, and if the purposes of his benignity may be best secured by a renewed interposal, we are warranted by his previous conduct to *expect* such an event.

After these preliminary strictures on Mr. Belsham's argument, you proceed to question the facts on which that argument is founded. The first that you controvert is, "that Christianity had its origin in Judea, in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar," your object is to show that there is no Evidence, that Christianity *did* originate then and there, and secondly that there is Evidence that it did not. In endeavouring to enforce the invalidity of the Evidence, that the Christian religion did originate in Judea, you think proper in a note to give "a specimen of the extracts from Jewish and Heathen testimonies adduced by Dr. Lardner as evidences of Christianity which he either receives, or *questions or rejects*, you exclaim, "enough! the reader, when patience shall have digested this specimen of what is called the Evidences of Christianity, may consider himself possess of all the intellectual wealth of the most laborious work perhaps that was ever written." What all? two octavo pages contain all the intellectual wealth of the most *laborious* work that was ever written? Was Dr. Lardner then a fool, will be the question of every rational man uninformed as to his character and work. This even you cannot pretend. And yet he, Dr. Lardner,—the author of the most laborious work that was ever written, produced only two pages—and those extracts, only two octavo pages of intellectual wealth.

Respecting the passage in Josephus which has been thought to recognize the existence of Jesus Christ, and the reputed origination of Christianity, I shall content myself by referring you to what I have said, and shall say on that head, in my correspondence with Mr. Carlile. The passage of Tacitus, then, requires our first attention. The words Nero subdidit elos, you thus translate—"Nero subdued the accused." Who were the accused? Nero, of having set fire to the city of Rome. Nero, therefore, subdued himself! Nay, you will reply, "it was the Christians that he subdued." Were the Christians, then, in arms against

Nero, that he was obliged to reduce them into submission. Your learning ought to have informed you, that *subdidit* does not signify "subdued," but substituted, or accused falsely.* And agreeably to this, the words are rendered by Dr. Lardner, "Nero procured others to be accused;" and by Murphy, "He determined to transfer the guilt to others." Either of these renderings restores the sense of the passage, which is lost in the oration. But you inform us, "even were this passage genuine, it does not pledge the separate testimony of its author to the origination of Christianity, but only to the accounts which Christians of the very worst of characters gave of it." Indeed! Where in the world is this to be found? I should have been content if the words "I conjecture" had been inserted in the above quoted sentence. Be it then known, that there exists not in favour of this conjecture even the shadow of a proof. Strong presumptions against it, however, are most obvious. Do Christians call their religion a fatal or destructive superstition? Do high-minded historians, such as Tacitus, resort to the dregs of the populace (as were the Christians according to Mr. Taylor) for the materials of their relations? Would Tacitus rely on the unsupported assertions of the "very worst of characters?"

Every reasonable man will answer each of these questions in the negative, and with this I dismiss the conjecture for the present, intending to offer some other remarks on the same subject in my rejoinder to Mr. Carlile's "distinct reply." But it does not prove the resurrection of Christ, says Mr. Taylor. No—nobody ever said that it did *prove* that fact. Yet it affords no mean presumption of its truth; otherwise, how, without the certainty of this, or some other miraculous interposal to attest *the truth* of Christianity, would Tacitus have found so soon after the death of Christ, "a very great multitude" of Christians at Rome? I have not been a little surprised, by referring to a note to which Mr. Taylor in this part of his oration directs his readers. So that he informs them that the resurrection of Christ was not so much as pretended in the time of Tacitus; and that the epistle of Clemens contains the strongest possible evidence of this fact. In making such a statement, Mr. Taylor must certainly have reckoned largely upon the ignorance of his readers, for the following are most positive testimonies from the Epistle of Clemens against the correctness of his assertions. Chap. xxiv., "Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord does continually shew us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has made our Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits, *raising him from the dead.*" —xxxvi., "By him (Jesus Christ) would God have us taste the knowledge of *immortality*, who being the brightness of his glory, is by so much greater than the angels, as he has by inheritance

* *Clavis Ciceron. et Oberl. Lex. Ciceron. Facciol.*

obtained a more excellent name than they."—"To the son, he (God) saith, 'Sit thou on *my right hand* until I make thine enemies thy footstool'"—xlii. The Apostles have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God, the Apostles by Christ; so both were orderly sent, according to the will of God. For having received their command, and being thoroughly assured *by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ*, they went abroad publishing that the Kingdom of God was at hand. And if "the resurrection of Christ was not so much as pretended to" in these early times, why should Celsus, in opposing Christianity, trouble himself to investigate the evidence on which the resurrection was grounded? These are his words, "Let us consider whether any one that has really died *ever rose again* in the same body."

However, let Mr. Carlile observe, that whatever the passage of Tacitus does *not*, it *does* give us an account of Christianity within the period that Jerusalem existed as a city with its temple.—"Christ," says Tacitus, "the author of that name or sect (Christians) had, by the procurator *Pontius Pilate*, been capitally punished in the reign of *Tiberius*,* and the fatal superstition for a while suppressed, again broke out not only *through Judea*, the origin of that evil, but in the city itself."

Mr. Taylor, however, will reply, that the passage is spurious, the words *auctor nominis ejus Christus, &c.* bearing evidently the character of a marginal note. And yet it is strange, if this be the case, that the discovery has been reserved for Mr. Taylor. Not a vestige of a suspicion does there exist of the spuriousness of the passage from any critic of acknowledged talent. Unbelievers and Christians, with all their perspicuity and ingenuousness, have never descried or hinted the least probability of an interpolation, although thousands of critical eyes, and some with an express view to detect errors,† have pored over the passage almost to blindness. Unbelievers, have hitherto been content, with Mr. Carlile, to regard this as a difficulty. But there is nothing equal to a little hardihood. It astonishes, and astonishment will tend to blind, if not to convince. The passage is spurious, says the master, and the scholars wonder, then admire, then believe. "It must be so, it removes a difficulty so easily." All this, however, proves that the difficulty is of no small magnitude, and while it induces a suspicion that this new discovery is something like a last shift, seems to indicate that affairs in some quarter are almost desperate. A drowning man, they say, will catch at a straw; and it is universally known, that a critic never

* But if the passage of Tacitus be genuine, as his writing, there remains the question to be settled, as to, *at what time he wrote and whether his authority was any thing better than the rumour of the ignorant Christians.*—
R. C.

† Oberlia's Tacit. præf.

resorts to conjecture till his pet hypothesis is perishing for lack of support. Let it, then, be observed, that our author does not attempt to deprive us of all the celebrated passage of Tacitus. He allows the former and latter part to be genuine, and restricts the interpolation within moderate limits. It begins we are informed, with the words—*Auctor nominis ejus Christus*. "The author of this name Christ," and terminates at *celebrantur que*, "and became famous." Mr. Taylor still permits us to remain in undisturbed possession of the existence of Christians, Mr. Carlile, in the reign of Nero (A. D. 68). Returning our best thanks to Mr. Taylor for that he did not conjecture away the whole, I shall endeavour to shew the abortiveness of the attempt that has been made. Mr. Taylor having lighted on the happy idea that the obnoxious sentence was spurious, sets himself to work to discover something that shall have the resemblance of proof. First then he informs his readers that it has "a parenthetical character, bearing evidently the character of a marginal note that had crept into the text and might with advantage to its construction be thrown out again," I deny that the passage evidently bears the character of a marginal note; I deny that it might with advantage to the construction be thrown out again. If "evidently," why is evidence not alleged. Notes are ready enough with Mr. Taylor on other occasions—why have we not one line explaining how the passage mars the construction? I ever take such words as "evidently," manifestly, clearly, &c. when given in place of evidence as sure indications of the want of evidence. They are general terms, which while they have the effect of putting the matter past doubt with superficial readers, and give to the proposition the semblance of a self-evident truth, are the mere cloaks of a writer's inability to adduce any thing that has the form and fashion of real evidence. Here then I might rest; my negative is as good as Mr. Taylor's unsupported affirmative. Nay, better, for it is ever considered the duty of one who affirms to support his affirmation by argument, and until this is done, a simple negative is regarded as a disproof. But a few words may be permitted me to vindicate the genuineness of the passage.

II. Tacitus, in the preceeding sentence, has mentioned the Christians, (*Christianos*). How natural to *describe* the persons he had just mentioned, persons comparatively unknown to the readers of history; how natural to state from whom and where they had derived their origin. I will suppose that an historian of these times should on the thread of his narrative have occasion to mention—say the Sandemanians—of whom the greater part of his readers would perhaps be wholly ignorant. Would he not feel himself called upon to add that these derived their name from Mr. Sandeman, with whatever other particulars he might possess or deem consistent with his object? That it was usual with Tacitus, as it is with every historian, to subjoin these descrip-

tive clauses, is seen in the fourth book of his history, chap. 81. where having mentioned Serapis, (a God of the Egyptians) he adds, "Whom this people, (the Egyptians) addicted to superstition, venerate before all others."

III. One reason given by Mr. Taylor for rejecting the passage in Josephus is, "the language is quite Christian." If then the language in Tacitus is quite *Anti-Christian*, an *opposite* inference is to be drawn. And the language is quite anti-christian, for it speaks of Christianity as an evil, a destructive superstition, and associates it with every thing atrocious and shameful. The language in Josephus then is Christian, and therefore the passage is not genuine. The language in Tacitus is anti-Christian and therefore *it is* genuine. Upon Mr. Taylor's own principles then the passage of Tacitus is proved not to be an interpolation.

IV. There is no propriety in the word *igitur*, therefore, which commences the sentence immediately after the important passage, if that passage be ejected from the text. "Therefore to suppress (not *extinguish a rumour*) to suppress the rumour Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishment upon those people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of Christians. Therefore they were at first apprehended who confessed," &c. No good and elegant writer would use two *therefores*, at the beginning of two consecutive sentences. It is true the two *therefores* in Tacitus are not as in English identical words. The one is *ergo* the other *igitur*, both meaning therefore. But I do not think that two consecutive sentences can be adduced from the writings of Tacitus, the first commencing with *ergo*, therefore, the second commencing with *igitur*, therefore. And I may safely undertake to affirm that no two such sentences can be shown which bear the same relation to each other as those in question; and this is the point which it is essential for Mr. Taylor to establish. Is it said that the word *igitur* is not an illative particle, a particle of inference, but merely a particle indicating transition. I will believe that Tacitus could have used a particle of transition, such as *igitur*, when a parallel instance is pointed out in his writings; but not before. For to what other subject is the transition made? To none, the subject is the same. The connective *que* or *et*, (and) would have been the proper word if nothing had intervened; and the propriety of the use of *igitur* arises solely from the fact that there is an interposed clause or clauses. These are my reasons for holding that the passage would *suffer* by the ejection of the intervening words. And if these reasons are substantial, the attempt of Mr. Taylor is abortive; the passage is genuine.

V. The style of the passage is the style of Tacitus and therefore it is genuine. It possesses all his characteristic brevity and compression.

But, says Mr. Taylor, the Christian fathers have not stumbled upon this. How know you that Mr. Taylor? They have not mentioned it. O! that is quite another matter. A man may stumble upon a passage without quoting it, I presume. And if they have not quoted, how many myriads of passages beside have they not quoted, yet who doubts *their* genuineness. But this was to their purpose. That I deny. There was no dispute in ancient times respecting the origin of Christianity. As far as we can learn, it was admitted on all sides to have arisen in Judea in the reign of Tiberius. No one when it was most easy to disprove this, ever moved a question about it. The Jews, Celsus and Porphyry, Hierocles and Julian, all concerned to overthrow Christianity, never denied its origination in Judea, and according to Tacitus, under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate. Nay, Celsus refers its rise to Judea and speaks of Jesus as the man of Nazareth, who had existed not long before his time, (A. D. 138.)

What propriety then could there be in these Christian Fathers adducing passages to prove what no one disputed? Nor is Mr. Taylor correct when he asserts, that Tertullian in his apology, chapter fifth, was anxious to enumerate all the facts that might recognize the origin of Christianity. It was not the object of the Christian apologists so much to defend their religion as to deprecate persecution. With this view it is that Tertullian is led in the apology to mention, not the facts that might recognize the origin of Christianity, but the instances of persecution that the Christians had met with at the hands of the Pagans. As far as it was necessary to secure this object, Tertullian does allude to the heathen authors, not as testimonies as they are now adduced to the origination of Christianity, but as proofs of undeserved cruelty, proofs which could not be questioned, because recorded by the Pagans themselves. Thus he says in his apology, cap. v. "Consult your histories, there you will find that Nero was the first to draw the bloody and imperial sword against this sect, then rising at Rome." What histories were there but those which we now have? Now none of these could teach the fact, that Christians were then rising at Rome, except it is the history by Tacitus.* From him, and from the very part that Mr. Taylor so boldly rejects, we learn the circumstance alluded to by Tertullian. Read the passage above quoted. It teaches you that Christianity had first appeared about thirty years before the period to which the narrative relates, that it was suppressed for awhile, and then having spread through Judea where it arose, it had reached the city, and gained a multitude of followers, as early as A. D. 68. As it had only arisen thirty years before, as it had been suppressed for awhile, as it had on its revival to pass over Judea before it came

* Might not Tertullian have taken his information from Iræneus?—R. C.

to Rome, it could not in the year 68, have been long resident in the city. In other words, it was then rising at Rome. Tertullian does then refer to the passage, as he refers to the only writer where the fact he mentions is to be found. He does not indeed go out of his way to quote the very words, for an allusion to the notorious fact was all that he needed for the maintenance of his argument. It is in a similar manner, not to define the time when and the place where Christianity originated, which was needless, but to evince the cruelties to which Christians were exposed, that Tertullian alludes to the letters that passed between Pliny and Trajan respecting their punishment. Speaking of the rescript of the latter he exclaims, "A decision replete with absurdity. He (Trajan) forbids Christians to be sought out, as being innocent, he commands them to be punished, as guilty, persons. He is merciful and cruel, he conceals and punishes."

"The world had never heard of this famous passage till the 16th century," &c. I shall begin with the latter part of the sentence, and by exculpating the character of Leo X., who might have expected a somewhat better character from the pen of a "Secretary" of "a society of learned men." Roscoe, in his Life of Leo X., speaks most honourably of this Pope, whom Mr. Taylor has so liberally aspersed. "With respect (says he) to the moral character of Leo in private life, the most satisfactory evidence remains that he exhibited not only in his early years, but after his elevation to the pontificate, an example of chastity and decorum, the more remarkable, as it was the more unusual in the age in which he lived."* And in reference to the distinct charge preferred against Leo by Mr. Taylor, the same excellent writer adds, "John Bule, in his satirical work, entitled The Pageant of Popes, in which in his animosity against the Church of Rome, he professes it to be his intention to give her *double* according to her works, has informed us that when Bembo quoted to Leo on some occasion a passage from the Gospel, the Pope replied, it was well known to all ages how profitable this fable of Christ has been to us. A story, (continues Roscoe) as it has justly been remarked, that has been repeated by three or four hundred different writers, without any authority whatsoever except that of the author above referred to, who is evidently a witness not to be received, as he wrote in open war against the Pope and the whole Catholic church." The uncorroborated assertion of a satirist, of an enemy, of one who professes it to be his intention to give a double portion, is worth nothing. What wretches the world would take Christians to be if they judged of them solely by the misrepresentations of Mr. Taylor's oration!

But whether the Pope was so depraved or not as to wish to falsify history, he had not the talent in this case to secure suc-

cess; and if he had the talent, he had not the opportunity for its exercise. You, Mr. Taylor, have indeed told us, that the world never heard of this passage till the 16th century. You are sadly misinformed. It was not the six last, but the five first books of the Annals of Tacitus, that were discovered in Westphalia in the 16th century. And it is in the six last that the important passage occurs. Hear your confutation in the words of Roscoe, and refer also to Brotier's edition of Tacitus in the preface. "The first five books of the Annals of Tacitus, which Lipsius afterward divided into six, and which had until then existed only in MSS. were brought from the abbey of Corvey, in Westphalia, by Angelo Arcionboldo. Such of the writings of that eminent historian which had before been discovered, *and which consisted of the last six books* of his Annals, and the first five of his History, had been printed by Johannes de Spire at Venice about the year 1468, and several times reprinted at Rome and Venice." The books then in which the passage in question is found had been printed in the year 1468, several times reprinted before the 16th century, and yet we are informed, that the world never saw the passage till that self-same 16th century. Long before Leo was born the passage was published to the world, and I suppose therefore that it is a good inference that he had no opportunity to fabricate it. When I read this plain account, so contradictory to your unqualified affirmation, I imagined that there must be somewhere an error. I thought you possessed the means of correct information, and I believed that you would use those means fully and publish the result to the world honestly. As therefore you appeared to me to use Ernesti's Tacitus, I thought that the Doctors might disagree; I took down his edition, and to my great surprise found the same tale told by him. The style in Ernesti's preface, it is true, is not so luminous as that of Brotier, nor perhaps so readable to some as Roscoe's plain English, yet any school-boy who knew that *ille* always refers to the remote antecedent, could not possibly have blundered. And if Mr. Taylor had been conversant with the writings of Tacitus, he might from a note of Lipsius, ad Ann. 2. 9. have corrected his egregious error. Let it then be borne in mind, that the part of Tacitus which contains the important testimony to the Christian religion was published in 1468, from a MS. which perhaps was written in the 8th century. From this MS. Ernesti supposes (for it is little more than supposition) all the other manuscripts were derived. How then, it will be asked, could Gibbon speak of all the ancient manuscripts? Here let me first remark, that we are by no means certain that they are all derived from this one; and Mr. Taylor is wrong to speak about it so positively as he does. Ernesti himself doubted, as may be seen in these his words—*Non audeam pro certo affirmare*, "I may not presume certainly to affirm it." And Brotier does not mention the fact, whereas if he had believed

it, little doubt can be entertained that he could have so done. It would then be sufficient to observe, that Gibbon, and he was no incompetent judge, did not believe that all the manuscripts were derived from one written in the 8th century. But what does Mr. Taylor mean when in his note he asserts, that this one copy, from which all the other MSS. are taken, is not more ancient than the 16th century? Why, bless me, he had just told us in the text, on the authority of Oberlia, that it was referable to the 8th century. Supposing, however, that Gibbon thought that all the MSS. were taken from one in the 8th century, still would there be great propriety in his remark respecting the agreement of all the ancient MSS. In every case all the MSS. must be traced to one eventually, the autograph; and what does it matter whether they be traced up to a manuscript in the 8th, or the 2nd century, provided we have reason to believe that this said MS. of the 8th century is a faithful transcript. Now of this no good authority ever made a question, and the consent of all the apographs shews that it was so. For though it be granted that this is the only MS. we have preserved to us referable to the 8th century, it by no means follows that no others existed in that century, and the reverse is the position that every competent judge would choose to assert. Now if this MS. had been tampered with, having a marginal note, or an erasure, or insertion, it is not credible that those who copied it, seeing its diversity from other manuscripts, would have all propagated its errors. The very circumstance, that all the transcribers copied the MS. in question, proves that they all deemed it a faithful transcript. As then every manuscript contains the disputed passage, with propriety Gibbon remarked that the consent of all the ancient MSS. proves its genuineness.

Some of my readers perhaps will be desirous of knowing what has set two avowed unbelievers, Mr. Gibbon and Mr. Taylor in opposition to each other. Mr. Gibbon had remarked that the most sceptical criticism is obliged to respect the integrity of this celebrated passage; and one reason that he alleges is the consent of all the most ancient MSS. Mr. Taylor chooses to call this an ironical concession, and adduces as one reason the palpable weakness of the argument. In exhibiting this weakness we see he has contradicted himself, referring a Manuscript now to the 8th now to the 16th century, and detected weakness where other people will see strength and propriety. * Pass we now to another reason alleged by Gibbon for the integrity of the passage. "The inimitable character of the style of Tacitus." Any clever man rejoins Mr. Taylor could imitate that style.—yes—but successfully? Nature, truth, have their imitations, but they differ widely from the original. The question is not whether the style can be imitated, but whether it can be imitated so successfully as to escape betraying traces of its origin to the keen eye of criticism. No

man's style is it *easy* to imitate, still less to imitate successfully. Johnson has had a large crowd of imitators, and yet it requires but little critical acumen to distinguish between the master and the scholars. In this as in many other things it is easier to describe a fault than to amend it; to expose a failure than to secure success.

Brotier has endeavoured to supply the loss we experience through the ravages of time in the works of Tacitus. Yet with all his skill, he disclaims any pretensions to equal the original, and if he had made them, they might soon be exposed. Still less could it be easy for a writer in the middle ages, imbued with the barbarous Latin of the schools, to assimilate his style to that of Tacitus. And even granting that his latinity might be as pure, we could never expect from such an one the same compression of thought, as we have in Tacitus. To write like him, a man must not only latinize but think as Tacitus. He must borrow his head as well as his pen; and it will not be easy to find a second Tacitus in the cells of the monks.

Again, says Gibbon, the reputation of Tacitus would guard his text from the interpolations of pious fraud. He is still sneering, answers Mr. Taylor, for how was it then that the reputation of Jesus Christ and his apostles never guarded their text from the interpolations of pious fraud. The reply is simply, that it did so to a great degree. Besides, there is this manifest difference, that the Christian documents were almost exclusively in the possession of Christians, while the writings of Tacitus were common to them and all the learned. There could be no hope of a safe interpolation in the writings of an author so celebrated, except the learned acquiesced to foist it on the world. But how does your next clause contribute to the confutation of Gibbon; "the more piety, the more fraud." Gibbon avers that the reputation of Tacitus guarded his text from pious fraud. No, exclaims Mr. Taylor, the more piety the more fraud. If you had said the more reputation the more fraud, your remark would have been relevant, but not the less futile. Then it would have been the greater the diversity of readers, the more likely are they to agree in corrupting an author. Gibbon's argument is directly the reverse of this, and it is a good one. The greater the diversity of readers, the less likely are they to concert an interpolation.

Upon the substance of your last remark, I have already said sufficient. The reasonings of Gibbon then are good, and consequently your supposition is groundless. But let us even grant you that they are weak, because a man reasons inconsequentially, does it therefore follow that he must speak ironically. If so, alas, for many writers! It would not be very easy to discover when certain persons are serious. No, Mr. Taylor, Gibbon had too much skill to allow his irony to remain undiscovered for years, as this has done, if it be irony. The witticism is worthless that requires a

commentary, and the irony that is not obvious had better never have been penned. The irony of Gibbon is fine, but it is perceptible on all occasions; otherwise it would fail of its designed effect. If the historian sneers, it is only to attract the more attention, and though he turns his head askant, still the sneer must be visible, or the labour is lost. And it is the more necessary that irony should be so well marked as to be easily perceived, because if it be not seen, a result takes place directly the opposite to what the writer intended. For irony has the appearance of conceding the very thing that is most strenuously denied; if then it be not obvious, that very appearance is converted into reality. Gibbon was too great a master of his art to incur this risk. Yet if your supposition be true, he has not only incurred the risk, but has reaped its consequences also from the publication of his works down to the year 1825, when you had the good fortune to descry his real intention. If, however, he had questioned the integrity of the passage, what should prevent him from speaking out? Questions of minute criticism are the last places for the introduction of irony: for, as in this instance, the palpable absurdity of the argument (which is always required in ironical writing) cannot possibly be conceived by the majority of readers. Would nine hundred and ninety-nine of Gibbon's readers out of every thousand know aught about the doubts of Ernesti, or the age of the manuscripts? And a note on this very passage in which he mentions the alleged interpolation in Josephus respecting Jesus, induces me to believe that had he entertained any rational doubt of the purity of the part of Tacitus in question, he could have spoken in as plain language in the one case as in the other. But we have still better evidence yet of his real opinion. He has a note on the very passage you choose to suspect, and assuming the truth of this passage he corrects an error of the Jews. "This testimony, alone," he remarks, "is sufficient to expose the anachronism of the Jews, who place the birth of Christ near a century sooner." He here argues on the genuineness of the passage, and, of course, believed that it was genuine. Of irony, therefore, he thought not. But if we are to get rid of difficulties this way, dragging them over to our side with a shout of irony, irony, struggle as they may, there is no point which we may not support by any arguments you may please to assign. The most positive testimony may thus be destroyed, for you have only to call it ironical, and you immediately reverse its purport. Such procedure however argues a lamentable deficiency of sound argument. In reference, moreover, to the matter in debate, we have a confiction of authorities. Mr. Taylor informs us that the "difficulty" is an interpolation. "No," says Mr. Carlile, "Tacitus wrote the passage in question, and wrote from the accounts of Christians." We cannot receive both, and in our vacillation between certain

No. 9. Vol. XIII.

authorities, no one can be surprized, if we abide by the old fashioned interpretation, and receive neither.

Whilst Mr. Taylor was occupied in conjecturing, he might as well have conjectured away the testimony of Pliny also. How easy were it to insert this letter in his collection. Conscientious scruples could have afforded no impediment. No matter that the letter is quoted by the Fathers; what they forged, that they could quote. Here, you see, is a good case at once, and a fearful enemy dispatched. Then as to Suetonius. Of course those who dealt in interpolation by the wholesale, could easily introduce a few words into his text. And thus the chief historical evidence for Christianity is spirited away. As, however, Mr. Taylor has not pursued his principles to their full extent, we will argue on his admission of the authority of Pliny's letter. And, you inform us, Mr. Taylor, "that Pliny could, on his most diligent enquiry, find nothing among the professors of Christianity but a vile and excessive superstition; not a precept, not a doctrine, not a circumstance, not an iota of Christianity." What, then, is this—"None of these things (i. e. invoke the gods, supplicate the image of Trajan, revile Christ) as is said they who are really Christians, can by any means be compelled to do." If this is not a circumstance, nay a *principle* of Christianity--of what is it a circumstance? Of Heathenism? Of Judaism? Of what? Gibbon shall answer (vol ii. chap. xi.): "It was the first but arduous *duty of a Christian* to preserve himself pure and undefiled by the practice of idolatry." And what, too, is this—"They affirmed that the whole of their fault or error lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a *stated* day, and sing among themselves a hymn to Christ as to a God." This, also, we are required to believe on your word, is not a circumstance peculiar to Christianity. The fact is in the quotation which you have made, and which gives a semblance of truth to your assertions, you have taken a passage out of its connection, and affirmed that of the whole letter which only relates to a small part of it. In justification of what I have now said, I will quote the passage with its connection. "After receiving this account," says Pliny, "I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid-servants who were called ministers. But I discovered nothing besides a bad and excessive superstition." By thus taking passages out of their connection the most contradictory propositions may be established from the works of any author.

This is another specimen, Sir, of your argumentative impartiality. And another follows. "Its professors were so exceedingly abandoned and wicked, that they could not trust each other; and when they met to sing hymns to Christ as to a God, it was necessary to swear that there should be no throat-cutting, adultery, nor theft, till the farce was over." The passage on

which the above representation is founded is the following:—
 “They affirmed that the whole of their fault or error lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day to sing hymns to Christ as to a God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of any theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed it was their custom to separate, and then come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne, since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies.”

The perversion practised in this case is the greater, because even unbelievers have regarded the passage of Pliny as an honourable testimony to the virtues of the primitive Christians. In this light, did Gibbon view it. “When the Christians of Bithynia were brought before the tribunal of the younger Pliny, they assured the Pro-Consul that far from being engaged in any unlawful conspiracy, they were bound by a solemn obligation to abstain from the commission of those crimes which disturb the private and public peace of society, from theft, from robbery, adultery, perjury, fraud.”* Nor can it be said that Gibbon is here giving loose to his ironical vein. He is discoursing of the virtues of the primitive Christians as one of the secondary causes that contributed to the rapid extension of Christianity. The reason why the Christians disclaimed any confederation to disturb the peace of society by private or public vices, may be seen in the circumstances in which they stood. They were an obnoxious people, their private meetings would give rise to unfavourable suspicions, especially as those of the Heathen exhibited scenes of the most disgraceful nature. It was necessary, therefore, to exculpate themselves from these groundless suspicions, and to assure the Pro-Consul that so far from meeting together to devise or commit crime, a solemn oath obliged them to the performance of the most important duties of social life.

After such an exhibition of error on your premises it may safely leave your inference, “there is then absolutely no evidence that Christianity originated in Judea, or in the reign of the emperor Tiberius,” to fare for itself, and proceed to the scrutiny of the evidence which you adduce to prove that Christianity did not originate in Judea.

The general scope, and the greater number of clear and positive texts of the New Testament treat, you inform us, of Christianity as already established in the world, and of great antiquity when the book was written. Of course the book treats of that as

* Vol. ii. cap. 11.

established whose establishment it records. This can be no great objection one would imagine. But something more than vague unsupported assertion might have been expected either in the text or notes, in regard to the other fact of which you apprise us, that the New Testament treats of Christianity as of great antiquity when the book was written. Out "of the greatest number of texts," it were easy to select some half-score to corroborate your statement. The person who advances an affirmative is always held bound to establish it, and until that is done a simple negative is deemed a sufficient reply. I might beat the air for a long time in combating what might have the shadow of appearance to be some of the multitude of texts, ready to be adduced in evidence. Until you have confirmed your bare assertion therefore, I might rest satisfied with denying its accuracy; but I make a gratuitous offer of the evidence of the Evangelist Luke, defining the time of the rise of Christianity, Luke i. 5. "There was in the days of Herod king of Judea," &c. Chap. iii. 1. "Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, &c." ver. 23. "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age."

The second evidence which you adduce from the Christian fathers will be found entirely to fail you. They it seems prove that Christianity did not originate in Judea, and disclaiming any thing like novelty and recentness in their religion, challenge for it the honour of a very remote and distinct origination.

To prove all this, so contrary to received opinion, you adduce one quotation from one writer.—One quotation from one writer to prove the consentaneous and consistent admissions of the earliest fathers! Surely there is some little disparity between your premises and your conclusions. Mr. Taylor propagated unbelief, in proof of which reference is made to one passage of his writings and thence comes the weighty inference, therefore the propagation of unbelief was the consentaneous and consistent practice of all the writers in the reign of George the fourth.

And not only this, but however early they are dated, these Christian fathers make this admission, and to establish the words of what?—one of the earliest of them? No—the words of one who was born in the middle of the 4th century! You write of course with a view to convince your readers. But really you pay a sorry compliment to their understandings, when you ask them to make such inferences from such evidence. From the works of Augustine then whom you quote to bear you through such a variety of assertions, permit me to adduce a passage in explanation which is parallel to your weighty proof. "The race of Christians he says is from the beginning." How so? Because—"all that have believed in one God which the Saviour preached may be called Christians. For the advent of the Saviour has been promised from the beginning, where John in the Apocalypse says,

"the lamb who was slain from the foundation of the world."* You might with as much propriety have brought the prolepsis of John to prove your point as the words adduced. Christians may be said to have always existed, because there have always been those who have maintained one of its characteristic doctrines the unity of God.

This is what Augustine asserts. A similarity of principles indicates a similarity of sect and in a vague way those may be designated by the same name who hold the same tenets. It is thus that Tindall contended that Christianity was as old as the creation, because its principles, if they are consistent with reason and nature, must be coeval with those relations that created beings sustain; and Dr. Sherlock was led to say that "the religion of the gospel, is the true original religion of reason and nature, and its precepts declarative of that original religion, which was as old as the creation."† No one can doubt that the duties which arise out of our various relations must be as old as the existence of those relations. But those duties may not have been fully known, nor the observance of them adequately sanctioned. And to supply the deficiencies arising from the comparative ignorance and inadequate inducements, attendant on natural religion, was it that a divine interposition was made by Jesus Christ. To establish indisputably however that the evidence you have pressed into your service, does not prove that Augustine was one of those whose consentaneous and consistent admissions, referred the origination of Christianity to remote antiquity, read these his words. "There (in Jerusalem) arose the religion of this designation" (belief in Christ.) He (Christ) died, says Augustine in the same connection under the consulship of the 2 Gemini," that is A. D. 29.† But had you, Mr. Taylor, thought proper to allow your reason to have before their eyes the whole of the passage you have adduced, you would not have been able to have given even the semblance of truth to your hardy assertions. These then, my readers, are the words of Augustine, and ask yourselves if they do not disprove that, to establish which part of them has been adduced. "That very thing which is now called the Christian religion, existed also among the ancients, nor has it been wanting from the beginning of the human race, until Jesus Christ himself came in the flesh, from which time the true religion which existed before began to be called Christian." And whether or not as you affirm the consentaneous and consistent admission of the earliest fathers prove that they denied the origin of Christianity to be very distant and remote, let my readers judge from the following facts. "We are but of yesterday (says Tertullian, A. D. 200.) and yet have we filled every place." "Tiberius (adds the same writer.)

* Aug. op. Basiled. 1563, vol. iv. 702.

† Sermon for propagating Gospel.

† Vol. 5. 1136.

Tiberius (A. D. 14.) in whose reign the Christian name was first known in the world.* Under the same emperor is its origination placed by Julius Africanus, Lactantius, Severus, Sulpitius and others.

We proceed then to your "thirdly," and in answer to your elegant metaphor of "dovetailing back every idea in the New Testament to the niches of pagan idolatry." I ask what has the scriptural idea of the unity of God, to do with idolatry or its niches, except to confound and destroy them? With this question dismissing your unsupported assertion. I shall argue as though your premises rested on something more stable than their present support, and ask, supposing that the fragments of which the New Testament is composed, existed before its composition, how does it hence follow that he who gave to these fragments a local habitation and a name, may not be called the author of that modification of them, under which they now present themselves to us? The world we read before it assumed its present state, was a rude indigested chaos, yet God is acknowledged by all Theists to have been the author of it. Many of the incidents wrought up in Shakspeare's plays may be traced back to the pages of the old romances, yet who hesitates to ascribe the composition of those plays to Shakspeare. If Jesus did nothing more than collect the scattered rays of light, and form them into one grand moral and intellectual luminary, no one, I presume, will deny that he was the maker of that luminary. Whether the ideas found in the New Testament can be dovetailed back to the niches of Pagan idolatry or not, they did not, I suppose, exist there in their present shape from the foundation of the world. At some time then there must have existed a person who liberated them from "durance vile" and embodied them in the glorious temple of truth which now shines so splendidly on those who choose to contemplate its beauties. And until you can show that this was done long anterior to the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, your argument is nothing worth for the establishment of your position. You may easily learn the cogency of your reasoning by expressing it in different words.

"I did not write the oration which has recently been published under my name—because there is not a single letter of it, beginning from the commencement of the alphabet and proceeding to its termination, which may not be distinctly traced back to the pages of authors who have produced one."

The next proof which you adduce that Christianity is of very ancient origin, you derive from the mythology of the Hindus. "It is an undeniable fact, you say, that the name of Chrishna or Christ (which I take to be identical), and the general outline of his story, were long anterior to the birth of our Saviour, and probably to the time of Homer, which we know very certainly."

* Apology, c. 36.

These, you add, are the words of the pious Sir William Jones, whom no man will charge with infidelity. The argument, therefore, must be good. But here a slip of memory has vitiated your reasoning, for you know "the more piety, the more fraud." This, you inform us, is a notorious fact. How, then, could you expect your readers to build any thing on so pious a testimony as that of Sir William Jones?

Passing over this contradiction, I shall weigh your argument on its own intrinsic merits. There are three points which solicit our attention. The alleged identity of the words *Chrishna* and *Christ*. The similarity of the outline of the history of each. The evidence of Sir William Jones, its outline and extent. First as to the names of *Chrishna* and *Christ*. How are words proved to be identical? By the similarity of the letters of which they are composed, and the identity of the root from which they are derived. Is this all? No: it must *also* be seen that their application is the same—all these three conditions must concur to prove a word identical, and the absence even of one of them precludes the possibility of identity. *Thomas* and *Richard* not containing the same letters are not identical names: *Messiah* and *Christ* are not identical designations for they are derived from two distinct roots. *Virtus* and *virtue* are not identical words; the first denotes valour; the second moral excellence. The latter is more extensive in its application than the former. A *Jacobite*, some centuries ago, and a *Jacobin* now, express not the same character; for then it meant a partizan of *James*, and now it means a factious leveller;—a *wig* as applied to a covering for the head, and a *whig* as descriptive of an adherent to certain political opinions, are not characteristic of the same things, are not identical words.

These three conditions, then, must concur to prove two words identical; and neither of these can you establish. In the names *Chrishna* and *Christ* there are four letters similar, and six dissimilar. No two words can be identical as far as their component letters are concerned in which there are six dissimilar letters. It will not, for a moment, be pretended that the words *Napoleon* and *Naples* are identical, though in them there are only two dissimilar letters, with five similar ones. In fact, if there was only one letter in the one which was wanting in the other, especially if that letter was a consonant, this would be sufficient to prevent us inferring from the component letters that the two words were identical. The truth of this remark may be strikingly illustrated from the Hebrew language. The words *Sereph* and *Tereph* differ only in their first consonant, and yet are very far from being identical words. As far, then, as the letters of which *Chrishna* and *Christ* are composed, the two names are not identical. The roots also of the two words are perfectly distinct. The one is Sanscrit, the other Greek—the one meaning to anoint, the other

denoting "dark blue, approaching to black."* The two roots then, are totally dissimilar, and the words, therefore, are not identical as far as it regards their derivation. Still less is the application of the words the same; if so—if it is the same, they are indifferently applied to the two persons in question. But the word *Christos* has never been used to designate the Indian God, nor the word *Chrishna* to designate the Jewish Messiah. Upon the clearest proof, then, does it appear, that words *Christos* and *Chrishna* are not identical. But similar actions are ascribed to both, and therefore they are one and the same person. Similar actions are ascribed to Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor; they both eat—drink—sleep. They both read and write; they both live in England, and in the 19th century; they both employ their tongues and pens against Christianity, clearly, therefore, are they the same persons. The argument of Mr. Taylor is founded on this kind of a syllogism. Identity consists in similarity—thus: The sun shines; the moon shines; the sun revolves round its axis; the moon revolves round its axis: the sun is acted upon by gravity; the moon is acted upon by gravity, therefore the sun is the moon. If this reasoning is not logical, instances of similarity prove nothing as to the identity of objects, if there are other dissimilar qualities essential to their nature. Let us, then, enquire if such dissimilar qualities exist between *Chrishna* and *Christos*.

Mr. Taylor has given in his oration the instances of similarity that exist between the histories of the two, and a little more than I can discover in Sir W. Jones. For he asserts "that there will be found the stories of his miracles, his preaching, and his actions, even to the minuteness of his washing the feet of his disciples." Implying that much more is to be found detailed in Sir W. Jones's works correspondent with the actions of Christ, than he has stated; nay, so much more, that it descends even to the minuteness of washing his disciples feet. But Mr. Taylor cannot verify his insinuation.

In the Sanscrit dictionary we have, says Mr. Taylor, the whole story of the incarnate deity born of a virgin, and miraculously escaping in his infancy from the reigning tyrant of his country who "sought the young child's life," and put to death all the children of the place of his nativity from "two years old and under." Whether Mr. Taylor would wish to intimate to his readers that the words included by him in italics, namely, "sought the young child's life" "from two years' old and under," are quotations from Sir W. Jones, or not, I will not undertake to say, although the impression on reading the passage is that he did so intimate. The ambiguity, however, is sufficient of itself to authorize me in apprizing my readers that they are not to be found

* Sir W. Jones's Works, vol i., p. 267.

in the pages to which Mr. Taylor has referred. Nor can I there discover the words used by Mr. Taylor "of the place of his nativity," or "miraculously," or "the reigning tyrant of his country," or that Chrishna was "born of a virgin." Making, then, the deductions which the foregoing remarks may justify, from the instances of similarity adduced, or conceived to be adduced by Mr. Taylor, and we have the following :--

Instances of Similarity.

- I. A tyrant at the time of the birth of Chrishna seeks his life, and orders all new-born males to be slain.
- II. Chrishna performs miracles.
- III. Chrishna preaches.
- IV. Chrishna washes the feet of the Brahmins.

Instances of Dissimilarity.

- I. Chrishna was an incarnate God.—Christ was a man.
- II. Chrishna was the son of Devaci and Vasudeva.—Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary.
- III. Chrishna was the predicted destroyer of the tyrant Cansa.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- IV. Chrishna is preserved from this tyrant by biting the breast, instead of sucking the poisoned nipple of a nurse commissioned to kill him.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- V. The birth of Chrishna was concealed.—That of Christ was declared at the temple.
- VI. Chrishna is fostered by a herdsman surnamed Ananda.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- VII. Chrishna while a boy slays a terrible serpent with a number of giants and monsters.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- VIII. At a more advanced age Chrishna puts to death his cruel enemy Cansa, and fomented and conducts a cruel war.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- IX. Chrishna passes his youth with cow-herd and milk-maid damsels in dancing, sporting, and playing on the flute.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- X. Chrishna is also called Vandiva, and Govinda, and Vanomali.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- XI. Chrishna saves multitudes by arms.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- XII. Chrishna is accused by certain nymphs who complain to Yasodi that the child Chrishna had been drinking their curds and milk.—No such thing read or said of Christ.
- XIII. Chrishna has a foster-mother, who reproves him for his indiscretion. On this, he requests her to examine his mouth, in which, to her amazement, she beheld the whole universe in all

its plenitude and magnificence.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

XIV. Chrishna exhibited an appearance of excessive libertinism, and had wives and mistresses in number at command.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

And if to this list I was to add all the actions ascribed to Christ, to which nothing parallel can be found in the history of Chrishna, which ought to be done in order to judge of the identity of the persons, the instances of dissimilarity would occupy no small part of this reply. We have seen then that the two persons in question have different names; were born in different countries; of different parents; are possessed of essentially different characters: and consequently they cannot be identical. One or two instances of similarity indeed have been adduced, but they are such as may be found to exist between persons confessedly distinct. The sun, therefore, is not more dissimilar, Mr. Taylor, to the moon, than is Chrishna to Christ. Neither are their names alike, nor their signification, nor their histories. So much for your "proof demonstrative;" so much for your "clearly-established alibi." Nor are my readers to imagine that Sir W. Jones was a man to be led away by this kind of demonstration. "The adamantine pillars of our faith (he says) cannot be shaken by any investigation of Heathen mythology." Another passage confirmatory of my statement is to be found in vol. i. p. 233. of his works.—"I who cannot help believing the divinity of the Messiah, (that is, the divinity of his mission) from the undisputed antiquity and manifest completion of many prophecies, especially those of Isaiah, in the only person recorded by history to whom they are applicable, am obliged of course to believe the sanctity of the venerable books to which that sacred person refers as genuine," (that is, the books of the Old Testament.) And if the result of his observations had been totally different, if he had seen the force of Mr. Taylor's demonstration, there can be no doubt that he would have acknowledged it, as he himself informs us, that if this had been the case in reference to the Mosaic account of the primitive world, namely, if he had found that account contradicted instead of confirmed by his historical researches, he would have published his conclusions, "not indeed with equal pleasure, but with equal confidence, for truth is mighty, and, whatever be its consequences, must always prevail." The avowed adherence then of such a man as Sir W. Jones, of so great a lover of truth, of one who had the best means of judging of the cogency of Mr. Taylor's demonstration—the avowed adherence to Christianity of Sir W. Jones, after the most accurate and minute investigation, is no mean presumption against the correctness of Mr. Taylor's inference, and in favour of my exposure of its supposed justness.

But even supposing my analysis of the pretended demonstration to be incorrect, of which I have no apprehension, but supposing, for the sake of argument, that the premises set up by Mr. Taylor remain good, the inconclusiveness of his deduction may be made apparent, and that in two ways:—First, Mr. Carlile tells us that Dr. Lardner's quotations from the works of early Christian writers in proof of the authenticity of the books of the New Testament, establish nothing, because these books may be made up of those very quotations themselves. In other words, Paul and John may have copied from Justin Martyr and Tertullian, instead of the latter quoting from Paul and John. The argument itself may be good, and its application in this case absurd. But not to dispute the propriety of either, it is clear by the shewing of unbelievers themselves, that the Indians may have borrowed from the Christians (if any loan at all be made which cannot be proved) as well as the Christians from the Indians. But it is said the outline was anterior to the time of our Saviour. Yes, but not the detail. This is not included in the "we know very certainly" of Sir W. Jones. Nay, the very reverse is implied, for he gives it as his opinion, that "the spurious Gospels had been brought to India, and the wildest parts of them repeated to the Hindus, who engrafted them on the old fable," or, in other words, on the general outline. Secondly: No one has ever suspected that Sir I. Newton borrowed his doctrine of attraction from India. Yet there, we are assured by Sir W. Jones, it existed long before the birth of our great philosopher, and the following is the chief passage in the writings of the Hindus on which he builds his opinion. "There is a strong propensity which dances through every atom, and attracts the minutest particle to some particular object; search this universe from its base to its summit, from fire to air, from water to earth, from all below the moon to all above the celestial spheres, and thou wilt not find a corpuscle destitute of that natural attractability; the very point of the first thread in this apparently entangled skein, is no other than such a principle of attraction, and all principles beside are void of a real basis; from such a propensity arises every motion perceived in heavenly or in terrestrial bodies; it is a disposition to be attracted which taught hard steel to rush from its place and rivet itself on the magnet; it is the same disposition which impels the light straw to attach itself firmly on amber; it is this quality which gives every substance in nature a tendency towards another, and an inclination forcibly directed to a determinate point."*

Two things then may present the *most perfect* resemblance and yet be derived from different sources, originate with different persons in different countries. Indeed this is nothing more than we now see daily before our eyes in the discoveries which are made

in the arts and sciences. Two discoveries shall be perfectly identical and synchronous, and yet be made by different individuals. A remarkable instance occurs in regard to hieroglyphics. M. Champellen in France, and Dr. Young in England, are disputing the claim of originality with each other as to certain advances which they have made in decyphering these sacred characters; whereas the truth seems to be, that each has a well-founded title to the credit of originality. I am aware that in these remarks I have undertaken more than was essential to the refutation of Mr. Taylor's hypotheses, but I have been desirous of shewing how very remote he is from "proof demonstrative" both in his premises and conclusions.

But Jesus could not have been the founder of the Christian religion, because he lived and died a Jew, so argues Mr. Taylor. In other words the friends cannot establish infant schools because they are not schoolmasters. Nor can there have been any such thing as a religious impostor, for he lived and died in the disbelief of that which he foisted on the world. The principle which is implied in this novel argument may thus be stated in general terms. No man can be the author of that which he does not practice. The authors then of all advice which they do not follow, a very numerous race; the writers on morality who do not equal in their practice the high tone which they approve and recommend; these with many other classes, are all annihilated by the cogent reasoning of Mr. Taylor.

Again, exclaims Mr. Taylor, how could he have been the founder of the Christian religion who never composed a single article of the Christian creed? Aye, how indeed? And how could Pythagoras have founded the Italic sect of Philosophy, or Socrates the Socratic school, they never committed any of their doctrines to writing? Of course no man can be the inventor of an art or an engine except he can explain in writing his discoveries to the world. He may communicate them by word of mouth, but this as Mr. Taylor argues proves that he was not the inventor of them. Yes, yes, there were no discoveries before the invention of the art of writing; this doubtless preceded every other invention and was devised when there was nothing to communicate through its medium. No man it is most clear is capable of inventing who is incapable of writing, and no one can found a sect, except he himself performs the duties of his secretary and historian. The cogency of this argument, Mr. Taylor, as well as its novelty are such that it can only be surpassed by that which succeeds it. "Yes, you say, on that ground, that single question might we rest the whole argument—who practises the precepts of Christ." Clearly, "how could he have been the founder of the Christian religion whose example no Christian follows, whose precepts no Christian practises." This at once proclaims you the most profound as well as the most original thinker of the present day. It is true some sceptic might object that the sun shines though his rays are not always felt, or that the laws exist though they are more honoured in the breach than in the observance, but these are demonstrably mere cavils. No law which is infringed can exist or have had an author. To prove the existence of a philosopher we must show that his doctrines are beloved; to establish the existence of Socrates we must prove that his moral precepts are observed. This "grand, this single" principle will decide the whole question respecting the fabled great ones of yore. Homer thou art a shadow—your moral precepts are neglected; Lycurgus and Solon you were "set up like Gog and Magog to frighten fools and idiots"—your laws were broken;

Aristotle you are a mere imagination, your dramatic unities are scouted by all the sensible part of the community; Ptolemy you are a "hero of fable;" your system of the universe is universally exploded. I might thus go on and disprove the real existence of most of those whom the credulous regard as having once taken up their abode on earth, but enough has been said to shew the cogency of this "grand" argument, the extent and facility of its application. The friends of Christianity must regret that Mr. Belsham was not more cautious than to admit that "the Christian doctrine at its first promulgation was the object of general abhorrence and contempt;" for as you most convincingly argue, as it is not so now, "here we have a complete surrender of all pretence to *divine* origination." That which was once despised and is not despised any longer, cannot of course have any pretensions to a divine origin. In youth men regard with delight what are called the beauties of nature, but when they grow older, some despise not only their romantic childishness but disregard and condemn the objects which nourished it, the world therefore to a demonstration has no pretence to a divine origin. All these, Mr. Taylor, are great discoveries in moral science and the art of reasoning. We have already Aristotle's Logic and Bacon's "Novum Organum," but as your method of argumentation cannot be traced to either of these, it remains that the world do you justice in ascribing some new name to the discoveries which it has been your good fortune to make.

But Homer sometimes is caught napping as Horace does more than insinuate, so it does not belong even to the most accurate reasoner to be always in the right. Mr. Belsham has said that the new religion was avowed by multitudes, and spread with astonishing rapidity through all the provinces of the Roman Empires. But you hint that historical facts frown on this statement. It is in vain that it is pleaded in justification of Mr. Belsham, that in the year 68, A. D., "an immense multitude" of Christians was to be found at Rome, or that in the year 106, Pliny found that Christianity ranked in its professors persons of every class, age and sex, had spread itself through cities, villages and the open country, caused a long intermission of the sacred rites, in Pontus and Bithynia: it is in vain, I say, that we plead this, for you reply that Mr. Gibbon's calculations have proved that not more than a twentieth part of the Roman Empire had embraced the Christian religion before the time of Constantine. Now, Mr. Gibbon in his first Vol. page 69, computes the total amount of Roman subjects to have been in the time of Claudius 120 millions. By his own computations then there appear to have been six millions of Christians prior to the conversion of Constantine. But there is so great a disparity between six millions and multitudes, that the reader cannot hesitate a moment about the accuracy of Mr. Belsham's statement. Aye, it was as you say a "bold" statement for him to make, that there were multitudes of Christians when there appear to have been only six millions. I wish, however, that in your next sentence, "in Rome itself previous to that memorable epoch (the conversion of Constantine) the tenets of Christianity had never been made the subjects of punishment, nor even of inquiry," I wish I say, in stating this on the authority of Mr. Gibbon you had allowed Mr. Gibbon to speak to us in his own language. For Mr. Gibbon says no such thing as you quote him to prove. He was too well acquainted with history and too chary of his reputation to make an assertion so opposed to the most notorious facts. What he really says is, that in the time of Nero, 68, and not in the time of Constantine, the fourth century, the religious tenets of the Christians were never made a subject of punishment, or even of enquiry. The interval of a few centuries you are aware makes a material difference in an argument.

The stories about the persecution and sufferings of the early Christians, you go on to assert, are falsified by the Christian fathers themselves, and the Christian scriptures. To prove that the Christian fathers falsify their statements, you quote a sentence of Gibbon which relates not to the sufferings of Christians generally but merely to the sufferings of the Apostles. Gibbon has stated a particular fact, this you have generalized and perverted. But the scriptures prove the same, it seems, falsify the stories of their persecution and sufferings; how so? Because "Paul preached at Rome, no man forbidding him;"—thence comes the conclusion, therefore, Christians in general were *never* persecuted; because in those scriptures it is read: "Who is he that shall harm you if ye be followers of that which is good?"—therefore Christians were *never* persecuted; because Christians had the means of rising superior to the persecutions they endured; therefore they were not persecuted, because, "their light afflictions wrought for them a far more exceeding love or eternal weight of glory;" therefore, they were not afflicted, because, "they suffered for righteousness sake" (as is read in the next verse to the one you have quoted;) therefore, they suffered not, because they "rejoiced in tribulation;" therefore, they were not troubled; because their "names were cast out as evil," therefore they were unmolested. After this manner of argumentation, Mr. Taylor, we grant you that the scriptures themselves do falsify the stories of persecution and suffering, and I am sure, I am willing that you should enjoy all the advantage which this concession can secure to your cause.

Your last argument against Christianity consists in what you designate "that grand fact, that persecution was entirely a gospel invention. The Pagans knew nothing of it;" "It was the blood-stained banner of the cross that first unfurled the maxims of religious persecution." In this "grand fact" there are two particulars which require our attention; the heathens never persecuted, nay, did not know even any thing about it; the Christians invented, and first practised persecution. It would be sufficient to call for your vouchers for this grand fact, but as some uninformed persons may have been accustomed to find them in an implicit faith in all that you assert, I deem it proper to put the most distinct negative on your unsupported affirmations; this is done by the evidence, first of Gibbon and Hume.

Gibbon says that Mr. Hume in the *Natural History of Religion* sagaciously remarks that the most refined and philosophic sects are constantly the most intolerant¹ by the words of Plato, "If a man neglect the gods by omitting sacrifices and despising oaths he must be punished. There are many who deceive others in this respect, deserving to die more than one or two deaths. Others deserve castigation and punishment. They who think so, (that the gods neglect human affairs) not from any bad principle but from a kind of madness, should be imprisoned not less than five years, without any citizen being allowed to go near them except to admonish them of their errors. If they, after this, continue in their impiety they must be punished with death." "Some who are obstinate in their opinions should be confined in prisons surrounded by the sea, where no free person should have access to them and when they die they should be buried without the bounds of the state, and if any person should bury them, he should be counted guilty of impiety."†—By Priestley, "as to the Heathen Philosophers they were so far from pleading in favour of toleration, that they were often the principal promoters of persecution. No Heathen Philosopher can be shewn to have been an advocate for toleration till the empire became Christian. Then indeed Libanius advanced

* Cap. viii. note 24.

† De Legator Lib.

his liberal sentiments on the subject. But in this there was no great merit when at that time the Heathens might be apprehensive of being exposed to that persecution by which they had made the Christians to suffer for near three hundred years"—By Mosheim, "in the time of no Emperor, after Nero the Christians suffered more or greater calamities than under Marcus Antoninus."⁴ And he ascribes the Emperor's acrimony against the Christians to the instruction of Philosophers and the hard-hearted Philosophy which he had embraced.—By Gibbon again, who thus speaks of the persecution by Julian, "I have endeavoured to represent the artful system by which Julian proposed to obtain the effects without incurring the guilt or reproach of persecution."⁵ These quotations teach us the principle and practice of Pagan philosophers; now as to the laws and conduct of Pagan states,—the most explicit negative is given to Mr. Taylor's assertion by Zenophon, who gives us the accusation under which Socrates suffered death at Athens, centuries before the birth of Christ. "Socrates is amenable to the laws, inasmuch as he does not acknowledge the recognized Gods of the state, but introduces others."⁶—By Cicero, "it is forbidden to any one to introduce any new gods or worship not allowed of by public authority."⁷—By Cicero again Protagoras for Atheism was banished from Attica and his books ordered to be burned by the common crier.⁸—By Brucker, Aristotle was persecuted "for propagating impious tenets."⁹ On this occasion it was, when leaving Athens, that he said, alluding to the tragical fate of Socrates, "I am not willing to give the Athenians an opportunity of committing a second offence against philosophy." By Brotier, who in his edition of Tacitus gives the law under which the Christians were punished by Nero, "Whoever introduces any new religion shall be punished; the more respectable shall be banished, the humble be put to death."¹⁰—By Gibbon once more who informs us that "the Egyptian superstition was frequently prohibited (in Rome) the temples of Serapis and Isis demolished and their worshippers banished from Rome and Italy;" and again by Gibbon, "Notwithstanding the general rules established for the conviction and punishment of the Christians, the fate of those sectaries in an extensive and arbitrary government must still in a great measure have depended on their own behaviour, the circumstances of the times and the temper of their supreme as well as subordinate rulers. Zeal might sometimes provoke, and prudence might sometimes avert or assuage the superstitious fury of the Pagans."¹¹ From Lardner, moreover, I learn that persecution or compulsion in religion was condemned by Tertullian, Lactantius, Athanasius, Constantine, Jovian, Valentinian.¹² Indeed the language of the Christian fathers was *Lex nova non se vindicat ultore gladiis*. The new religion does not assert its authority by the sword, the style of the Councils, *Nemini credendum vim inferri*. It is not right to use violence in order to procure belief. Gibbon too, though with a sneer, bears his testimony to the peaceful spirit of the early Christians "Faithful to the doctrine of the apostle who in the reign of Nero had preached the duty of unconditional submission; the Christians of the three first centuries preserved their conscience pure and innocent of the guilt of secret conspiracy or open rebellion. While they experienced the rigour of persecution they were never provoked either to meet their tyrants in the field or indignantly to withdraw themselves into some remote and sequestered corner of the

⁴ Priestley's works vol. 17. p. 66,

⁵ Vol. 4. p. 138.

⁶ De Leg. Lib. ii. c. 8,

⁷ Hest. Philo. vol 1. 264.

⁸ Vol. 4. p. 497.

⁹ De Reb, Christ 246.

¹⁰ Memorab. Lib. cap. 1. and Sturz's Lexicon Zenophont.

¹¹ De nat. dro. Lib. 1.

¹² Vol. 1. p. 12.

¹³ Vol. 2. p. 443.

globe. The Christians when they deprecated the wrath of Diocletian, or solicited the favour of Constantine could allege with truth and confidence that they held the principles of passive obedience, and that in the same space of three centuries their conduct had always been conformable to these principles."¹² And it is well known that in the year 313, Constantine by an edict gave full liberty to all men to act according to the best of their judgment in things of religion. Nor, though his conduct cannot be wholly reconciled with this equitable decree, is it liable to all the imputations with which some asperse his character. In confirmation of this I refer, (for the extract would be too long,) your readers to Gibbon's account of what he calls the "toleration of Paganism" under Constantine.

Judge now then, my readers, of the correctness of the assertions which called forth these authorities. Is the "grand fact" true, "that persecution was entirely a Gospel invention, the Pagans know nothing of it?" And as you, Mr. Carlile, in your reply, draw a contrast between Christianity and Paganism in the matter of persecution unfavourable to the first, think of the fate of Protagoras, and Socrates, and the principles of Plato, one of your immaculate heathens, and then say whether, ill as you have undoubtedly been treated, you would not have had more to fear under a pagan government, than you have suffered under what you deem a Christian one.

J. R. BEARD.

¹² Vol. 3. cap. xi. 248.

NOTICE.

THE length of Mr. Beard's Letter to Mr. Taylor excludes many articles that were prepared for insertion in this Number; but I am desirous of giving this industrious preacher of heretical Christianity fair play. Next week, I shall insert a similarly lengthy Letter from the same gentleman addressed to myself, and confine my rejoined observations to a few notes. Correspondents must therefore have patience.

To customers and country agents I have to say, that I can supply them from the stock recovered from the Sheriff with almost every thing that I ever published. Much has been sent for waste paper, even to a ton weight; but "The Deist" may be had perfect in 2 vols. or in parts.—R. C.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 135, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican," to be left at the place of publication.